

REMARKS

Claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-29 and 31-36 are pending in this application, of which claim 1 has been amended. No new claims have been added.

The Examiner has maintained all of the prior art rejections from the previous Office Action of February 10, 2003, except for the following new rejection:

The 35 U.S.C. §103(a) rejection of claims 12, 14, 15, 17-29 and 31-35 as unpatentable over Yoshizawa, et al. and Hollis (both previously applied) and JA 3-64105 to Yoshio, et al (hereafter "Yoshio, et al.").

Regarding the other maintained claim rejections, it was argued in Applicants' response of May 23, 2003, that Noriyuki discloses an antenna comprising a core of laminated rectangular plates with coils 6a and 6b wrapped in a direction perpendicular to the greater rectangular dimension of the magnetic core. This is in contrast to the present invention, in which the coils are wrapped in a direction parallel to the greater rectangular dimension of the magnetic core.

The Examiner has disagreed, arguing the following:

Applicant's arguments filed May 23, 2003 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, the language "a greater rectangular dimension" is not to be read as the length of the core in Noriyuki. The greater rectangular dimension is the horizontal dimension in Fig. 1 of Noriyuki, the same dimension that the winding is wound upon. The claims read on this reference structure.

Applicants respectfully disagree. Fig. 1 of the instant application shows dimensions A and B as the length and width of the core where the core is composed of layered thin metallic plates

having a thickness of 20 to 50 μm , as disclosed on page 5, lines 8-16 of the specification of the instant application.

To clarify this distinction, claim 1 has been amended to recite that the “greater rectangular dimension” recited therein is in reference to the plates facing the core. Thus, the Examiner may not consider the thickness of the core formed of the plurality of the plates in determining which rectangular dimension of the core is larger.

In regard to the rejection of claim 12, the teachings of Yoshio, et al. and Hollis may not be combined to teach the present invention because the non-overlapping antenna arrangement in Yoshio, et al. clearly teaches away from the overlapping (and mutually inductive) antenna arrangement in Hollis.

Thus, all of the prior art rejections should be withdrawn, and a Notice of Allowance is earnestly solicited.

In view of the aforementioned amendments and accompanying remarks, claims 1-5, 8-12, 14, 15, 17-29 and 31-36, as amended, are in condition for allowance, which action, at an early date, is requested.

If, for any reason, it is felt that this application is not now in condition for allowance, the Examiner is requested to contact Applicants' undersigned attorney at the telephone number indicated below to arrange for an interview to expedite the disposition of this case.

In the event that this paper is not timely filed, Applicants respectfully petition for an appropriate extension of time. Please charge any fees for such an extension of time and any other fees which may be due with respect to this paper, to Deposit Account No. 01-2340.

Respectfully submitted,

ARMSTRONG, KRATZ, QUINTOS,
HANSON & BROOKS, LLP



William L. Brooks
Attorney for Applicant
Reg. No. 34,129

WLB/alw
Atty. Docket No. 960630
Suite 1000
1725 K Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20006
(202) 659-2930



23850

PATENT TRADEMARK OFFICE